

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1-20 have been rejected. Of these claims, claims 1 and 11 are independent in form. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of the following remarks.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

Claims 1-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,557,665 to Yamamoto ("Yamamoto") for the reasons set forth on page 2 of the Office Action. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Office Action generally states that Yamamoto teaches "the invention of claims 1-20 for sharing telephone devices (read as the desk sharing)" and specifically states that "Yamamoto teaches executing a desk sharing application via the TELEPHONE SERVICE EXECUTING DEVICE (505) in FIG. 1; . . ." It is respectfully submitted that Yamamoto does not teach or suggest a "desk sharing application" as recited in the independent claims.

Page 1, lines 19 – 22 of the specification for the present invention states that "A desk sharing application is a software program, typically incorporating a graphic user interface (GUI), that is used to view shared office spaces and their associated devices and to allow authorized users to reserve these office spaces and resources." It is respectfully submitted that Yamamoto does not teach viewing shared office spaces and their associated devices and therefore claims 1-20 are allowable over Yamamoto for at least this reason.

The Office Action also states that Yamamoto teaches ". . . automatically transferring the full user identity and feature functionality via CHECK TELEPHONE TERMINAL DATA CORRESPONDING TO ID CODE (S56) FIG. 10; . . ." It is respectfully submitted that Yamamoto does not teach or suggest a "automatically impersonating full user identity and feature functionality from said dedicated telephone device to said shared telephone device" as recited in the independent claims.

Col. 7, lines 28 – 34 of Yamamoto states that "In the step S56, the second memory table 703 and the corresponding telephone terminal data memory 701 are checked based on the individual identification information in order to determine whether telephone terminal data corresponding to the individual identification information are established or not." This

checking function and determination function does not teach or suggest “automatically impersonating full user identity and feature functionality from said dedicated telephone device to said shared telephone device”.

The Office Action additionally alleges that Yamamoto “makes the distinction between dedicated telephone devices (reads on the own telephone terminal) and shared telephone devices at column 1, lines 32 – 37.” However, assuming this statement is correct for sake of argument, it is respectfully submitted that Yamamoto differentiates the referenced language in col. 1, lines 32 – 37, as prior art from his own invention, and the mere acknowledgement of a distinction between dedicated telephone devices and shared telephone devices does not teach or suggest combining it with his invention, nor does it teach or suggest Applicant’s invention.

Furthermore, the specification for the present invention describes “impersonation”, which the Office Action does not address. For example, page 3, lines 20 – 24 of the specification states that “Under the present invention an ECP node will possess an expanded telephonic device impersonation capability (where “device impersonation” as used here can include a simple mirroring of features or an actual transfer of functions and features, as will be understood by those skilled in the art) that is integrated with the desk sharing application.”

It is therefore respectfully submitted that Yamamoto does not teach “automatically impersonating full user identity and feature functionality from said dedicated telephone device to said shared telephone device” and therefore claims 1-20 are allowable over Yamamoto for at least the reasons set forth above.

### **Dependent Claims**

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action did not address the features of the dependent claims. Applicant traverses the rejections of the dependent claims and submits that dependent claims 2-10 and 12-20 are also allowable for at least similar reasons as stated for the independent claims from which they depend. Applicant however, reserves the right to address any individual rejections of the dependent claims should such be necessary or appropriate.

**Double Patenting Rejection**

Claims 1-20 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over the claims of co-pending US Patent Application No. 10/610,451. (See Office Action, page 3) While Applicant does not necessarily agree with the characterization provided by the Examiner of the claims allegedly in conflict, because this rejection is provisional since none of the claims identified as being in conflict have yet been patented, Applicant defers addressing the provisional rejection of claims 1-20 as such response is premature. Applicant reserves the right to address such rejection when appropriate.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully request reconsideration of this application. All claim rejections having been addressed and the claims as presented herein being believed allowable, Applicant submits that the application is hereby placed in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

Applicant believes that the concurrently filed Petition for a One-Month Extension of Time makes the Request for Reconsideration a timely submission and that no additional fees or extension of time are required for this Request for Reconsideration. However, should an extension of time be required for the timely submission of this paper, such extension is hereby petitioned and the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for this paper, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

In the event that a telephone conference would facilitate prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,



Francis G. Montgomery  
Reg. No. 41,202

Siemens Corporation  
Intellectual Property Department  
170 Wood Avenue South  
Iselin, NJ 08830  
(732) 321-3130 (Telephone)  
(732) 590-1290 (Facsimile)